

## **REMARKS**

Claims 1-26 are pending in the present application. By this Preliminary Amendment, claims 1, 10, 14, 21, 25 and 26 are amended. Claims 1, 14 and 25 are amended to recite the features of initiating at a client an initial request for client configuration information; sending from the client the initial request for client configuration information to a first boot server; and receiving at the client a boot server list if the client configuration information is not found on the first boot server. Claims 10, 21 and 26 are amended to recite sending from the boot server the boot server list to the client if the client configuration information is not found. Support for this amendment may be found at least in Figure 6 and the corresponding text in the specification. Reconsideration of the claims in view of the above amendments and the following remarks is respectfully requested.

### **I. Distinctions of the Claims over the Cited Art**

The Final Office Action maintains the rejections of claims 1-26 under 35 U.S.C. § 102 as being allegedly anticipated by Chatwani et al. These rejections are respectfully traversed for at least the reasons set forth in the June 10, 2004 Response, the remarks of which are hereby incorporated by reference.

With regard to claims 1, 14 and 25, Chatwani does not teach initiating at a client a initial request for client configuration information; sending from a the client an the initial request for client configuration information to a first boot server; receiving at the client the a boot server list if the client configuration information is not found on the first boot server; and sending from the client a configuration information request for the client configuration information to each server in the boot server list until the client configuration information is found or a request has been sent to every server in the boot server list.

Although the Examiner asserts that the CMS is a client. The Chatwani CMS merely receives a request from a client, formats a TFTP request and forwards the request to the boot server, see column 34, lines 35-36. Thus, while the Chatwani CMS may act

as a client and send a request to a boot server, the request was not initiated by the CMS. Additionally, Chatwani does not teach receiving a boot server list at the client if the client configuration information is not found on the first boot server. Although the Examiner alleges that the hunt group that is used by the CMS in determining configuration is a boot server list, the hunt group is not received by the client that initiated the initial request for client configuration information. Since the Chatwani client that initiated the request for client configuration is not the same client that makes use of the hunt group, then Chatwani does not teach sending from the client a configuration information request for the client configuration information to each server in the boot server list until the client configuration information is found or a request has been sent to every server in the boot server list.

With regard to claims 10, 21 and 26, Chatwani does not teach receiving at a boot server an initial request for client configuration information from a client, wherein the initial request is initiated at a client; and sending from the boot server the boot server list to the client if the client configuration information is not found. As shown above, the request sent from the CMS is not initiated at the CMS, but rather received from another client, reformatted, and forwarded by the CMS.

Therefore, for at least the reasons set forth in the Response filed June 10, 2004, and the additional features added by this Preliminary Amendment, the present independent claims 1, 10, 14, 21, 25 and 26 define over the Chatwani reference. At least by virtue of their dependency on claims 1, 10, 14 and 21, the specific features of dependent claims 2-9, 11-13, 15-20 and 22-24 are not taught by Chatwani.

## II. Conclusion

It is respectfully urged that the subject application is patentable over the prior art of record and is now in condition for allowance. The Examiner is invited to call the undersigned at the below-listed telephone number if in the opinion of the Examiner such a telephone conference would expedite or aid the prosecution and examination of this application.

DATE: November 17, 2004

Respectfully submitted,

Francis Lammes

Francis Lammes  
Reg. No. 55,353  
Yee & Associates, P.C.  
P.O. Box 802333  
Dallas, TX 75380  
(972) 385-8777  
Agent for Applicants